

Filed on behalf of: VirnetX Inc.

By:

Joseph E. Palys
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
11955 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5675
Telephone: (571) 203-2700
Facsimile: (202) 408-4400
E-mail: joseph.palys@finnegan.com

Naveen Modi
Paul Hastings LLP
875 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 551-1990
Facsimile: (202) 551-0490
E-mail: naveenmodi@paulhastings.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

VIRNETX INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00485
Patent 8,051,181

**Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
of U.S. Patent No. 8,051,181**

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction.....1
- II. The Petition Fails to Meet the Requirements for Instituting an *Inter Partes* Review2
 - A. The Petition Must Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)2
 - 1. Procedural History Relevant to § 315(b)4
 - 2. The Plain Meaning of § 315(b) and the Board’s Precedent Bar the Petition.....6
 - 3. Apple’s Untimeliness Precludes Joinder Under § 315(c).....6
 - B. The Petition Fails to Comply with 35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(3)-(4) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b).....9
 - C. Apple’s Petition Should Be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....16
 - D. The Board Should Not Institute Based on the Petition’s Redundant Grounds.....18
 - E. Apple Asserts an Anticipation Ground Based on Three Documents, Contrary to Basic Anticipation Law21
- III. The Petition’s Claim Constructions Are Flawed and Should Be Rejected23
 - A. Overview of the ’181 Patent.....24
 - B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art25
 - C. “Secure Name Service” (Claims 2 and 28)27
 - D. “Secure Name” (Claims 1-5, 8, 10, 11, and 22-29)30
 - E. “Secure Domain Name” (Claim 3)32
 - F. “Unsecured Name” (Claims 1, 21, 26, and 27).....32
 - G. “Secure Communication Link” (Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 25, and 28).....33

H. “Client Computer” (Claim 20)38

IV. If Trial Is Instituted, VirnetX Requests an 18-Month Schedule41

V. Conclusion42

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	22
<i>Apple Inc. v. Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00079, Paper No. 8 (Apr. 25, 2014).....	11, 14, 15
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	21, 22
<i>Atrium Med. Corp. v. Davol Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00186, Paper No. 34 (Oct. 23, 2013)	11
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	35
<i>CaptionCall, LLC v. Ultratec, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00549, Paper No. 20 (Apr. 28, 2014).....	13
<i>Dell, Inc. v. Network-1 Sec. Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00071, Paper No. 17 (July 29, 2013)	9
<i>EMC Corp. v. Personal Web Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00087, Paper No. 25 (June 5, 2013).....	19, 21
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001, Paper No. 15 (Jan. 9, 2013).....	36
<i>Google Inc. et al. v. Everymd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper No. 9 (May 22, 2014).....	10, 14
<i>Gracernote, Inc. v. Iceberg Indus. LLC</i> , IPR2013-00552, Paper No. 6 (May 7, 2014).....	14
<i>Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00027, Paper No. 26 (June 11, 2013).....	19
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper No. 19 (Nov. 21, 2013)	16, 17

Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n,
545 F.3d 1340, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)22

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.,
CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 7 (Oct. 25, 2012).....18, 19, 20

Motionless Keyboard Co. v. Microsoft Corp.,
486 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2007)23

Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Mobile Scanning Techs., LLC,
IPR2013-00093, Paper No. 28 (Apr. 29, 2013).....36

Quad Envtl. Techs. Corp. v. Union Sanitary Dist.,
946 F.2d 870 (Fed. Cir. 1991)23

ScentAir Techs., Inc. v. Prolitec, Inc.,
IPR2013-00180, Paper No. 18 (Aug. 26, 2013)19, 21

Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.,
IPR2012-00041, Paper No. 16 (Feb. 22, 2013)11

Tasco, Inc. v. Pagnani,
IPR2013-00103, Paper No. 6 (May 23, 2013).....11

Wowza Media Sys., LLC et al. v. Adobe Sys., Inc.,
IPR2013-00054, Paper No. 16 (July 13, 2013)11

Xilinx, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC,
IPR2013-00112, Paper No. 14 (June 27, 2013).....36

ZTE Corp. & ZTE (USA) Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2013-00134, Paper No. 12 (June 19, 2013).....36

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 3117, 8, 9

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)9

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....1, 10

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(4).....1, 10

35 U.S.C. § 3131

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.